| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | .Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | 09/778,101 | SKOOG ET AL. | |
| | Examin r | Art Unit | |
| | Ian N Moore | 2661 | |
| All Participants: | Status of Application: | | |
| (1) <u>lan N Moore</u> . | (3) | | |
| (2) Roger S. Burleigh. | (4) | • | |
| Date of Interview: <u>11 January 2005</u> | Time: <u>10:54 AM</u> | | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ No | nt's representative) | | |
| Part I. | | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: None | | | |
| Claims discussed: 1,3,5,7-9 | , | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: None | | | |
| Part II. | | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER Lack of antecident basis liminations and a few minor informalities | | | |
| Part III. | | | |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary | e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the | en summary of the substance interview, since the interview | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| In v home | | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant | Applicant's Representative S | ignature – if appropriate) | |